

Amendments to the Drawings

Fig. 1 has been objected to for showing receiving module (12) as “TX Filter” and similarly transmission module (15) as “TX Filter.” In response, Applicant submits herewith replacement drawing sheets for Fig. 1, providing the necessary correction. The change to the figure is limited to the correction of the unclear understanding of “TX Filter.” As such, no new matter is added. Having complied with the request set forth in the Action, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to the identified figure.

REMARKS

This is in response to a Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment dated November 14, 2007. The Office Action dated August 10, 2007 objected to Fig. 1 for showing receiving module (12) as "TX Filter" and similarly transmission module (15) as "TX Filter." As stated above in response, Applicant submitted a replacement drawing sheet for Fig. 1, providing the necessary correction. Applicant erroneously included the original drawing sheets for Figs. 2, 3a, 3b, and 4. No amendments were made to Figs. 2, 3a, 3b, and 4. Fig. 1 was the only corrected drawing sheet. Applicant resubmits the previous response and only includes the replacement sheet for Fig. 1. It is respectfully submitted that the grounds for the non-compliant amendments to the drawings have been overcome and the claims are in condition for allowance. As we have corrected the non-compliant Amendment, we request the Examiner now consider the merits of the previous response.

The Applicant has carefully reviewed the Office Action dated August 10, 2007. Claims 1-20 are all the claims pending in this application. It is submitted that the application as amended is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's acknowledgement in the Office Action Summary of a claim for foreign priority under 35 USC 119. A certified copy of the Foreign Priority Application was filed with the Office on August 23, 2003. The Office Action Summary states that some of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received. Examiner states that the Office Action will list the certified copies not received. However, Applicant submits that the Office Action does not list the missing

documents. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner identify which certified copies which have not been received or acknowledge receipt of “all” the certified copies of the priority documents in the next PTO communication.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Na (U.S. 6,622,276) in view of Soulabail et al. (U.S. 2002/0071415). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections, and requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims in view of the following arguments.

103 rejections Na in view of Soulabail

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Na in view of Soulabail.

Claim 1 recites a mode switching method in a mobile communication system comprising “providing a mode switching start point between an uplink signal and a downlink signal of a transceiver, resetting the mode switching start point based on length of a guard period provided between the uplink signal and the downlink signal.”

Page 4 of the Office Actions states that Figs. 1 and 3, col.5 lines 14-27, and col. 9 lines 8-37 of Na disclose “resetting the mode switching start point based on length of a guard period provided between the uplink signal and the downlink signal.” Applicant respectfully disagrees.

A review of the cited portion of Na does not reveal a discussion of a “mode switching start point based on length of a guard period,” as recited in claim 1. Col. 4 lines 28-47 of Na disclose a “high frequency switch” for switching between “transmission mode” and “reception mode.” Specifically, Col.4 lines 35-39 of Na discloses that the high frequency switch “is controlled in response to a switching control signal periodically generated by a controller at intervals of a predetermined time (e.g., 2 millisecond intervals in this application) with a duty rate of 50:50.” (Emphases Added). Additionally, col. 9 lines 13-15 state that “the transmitter and the receiver are alternately enabled for the specific time interval.” (Emphases Added).

Na further provides “in accordance with the present invention, the radio communication system, the CT-2, switches the operational modes at an interval of 2 ms; i.e., it is set to the transmission mode for the first 1 ms and to the reception mode for the next 1 ms.” (Na, col. 9 lines 24-28). These passages make clear that any so-called start point is set based on the amount of time that a previous transmission mode has been activated (i.e., after 1 ms). There is absolutely no mention of a “guard period,” such as that which is recited in claim 1.

Moreover, the Na system emphasized operational modes of 2 ms. This 2 ms period is defined as a 1 ms transmission mode and a 1 ms receiving mode. (Na, col. 9 lines 25-27). Thus, according to Na, there is no period between transmission/receiving. Since Na discloses no period between transmission/receiving, it cannot therefore disclose

a “guard period provided between the uplink signal and the downlink signal,” as required by claim 1.

For the reasons stated above, Na does not teach all of the elements recited in amended claim 1. Additionally, Soulabail does not cure the stated deficiencies of Na. Accordingly, even if one of ordinary skill were to combine these references in the manner alleged, the resulting system would not teach all of the elements of claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the cited references. Additionally, independent claims 10, 11, and 20 contain language similar to that of claim 1, these claims are also believed to be allowable for reasons similar to those set out in conjunction with claim 1. Additionally, dependent claims 2-9 and 12-19 are allowable by virtue of their dependence to the allowable independent claims.

Conclusion

In light of the above remarks, Applicant submits that the present Amendment places all claims of the application in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California, telephone number (213) 623-2221 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Lee, Hong, Degerman, Kang & Schmadeka

Date: December 14, 2007

Customer No. 035884

By: 

Richard C. Salfelder
Registration No. 51,127
Attorney for Applicant